UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR $13-662-85$
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRADICT
Clefford Bercauch Defendant.	OCT 2 8 2013
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on	RICHARD W. WIEKING /0/88 2013, the PERKUS DESTRICT COURT 2013 the PERKUS DESTRICT COURT and the country of th
Speedy That Act from $1/2/3$. $2013 \text{ to } 1/2$	ublic and the defendant in a speedy trial See 18 U.S.C. s
Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 16 27 13	JOSEPH C. SPERO
	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney